48 pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 6, 2006

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, April 6, 2006, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm.

Of the current roster of sixty-two senators, forty-two were present. Senators Cheung, Hamed, Lillie, Linc, Ofobike, Qammar, Riley, Siebert, Slowiak and Vijayaraman were absent with notice. Senators Davis, Gamble, Maibach, Norfolk, Rich, Schantz, Steiner, Taylor, Wilburn and Zingale with absent without notice.

I. <u>Approval of the Agenda</u> – Chair Fenwick greeted everyone and asked for a motion to approve the Agenda for this meeting. Senator Steiner made the motion; Senator John seconded the motion. The motion carried.

II. <u>Approval of the Minutes</u> – Chair Fenwick announced that the Minutes from the February 16 meeting had just arrived so approval of those Minutes would be postponed until May.

III. <u>Special Announcements</u> – Chair Fenwick announced candidates for the Administrative Assistant to the Senate position had been interviewed and that a recommendation was being forwarded. He expressed his hope that Senate would have a full-time administrative assistant by May.

He then followed with a few brief comments. "First of all, I want to welcome you to Spring, finally! I was beginning to wonder yesterday morning, but it feels much more 'spring-like' today. Spring always, at least to me, brings the promise of renewal and change. There's also the promise of mowing my lawn, which is not so much a promise as a threat. But the hope for renewal and change for the better is always a sign of spring. I think this is true, we hope, for the items on today's agenda.

In particular, we will hear a report from the Well-being Committee regarding the development of a future committee that tends to encompass the interests of all campus employees regarding well-being and benefits all employees—both those in bargaining units and outside bargaining units. We will also hear the final report of the Senate *Ad hoc* Committee on Decision-Making and its recommendations on how to further proceed in developing a more inclusive, a more transparent, and a

more effective and influential body of university governance. Both of these involve reform—rethinking the old ways of doing things and reconstituting them into what we would hope to be best practices.

I was most encouraged yesterday by the news out of Massachusetts on an entirely different subject. The Massachusetts Legislature is about to pass pending legislation that mandates a state-wide universal health system. What is most encouraging to me at this point about this legislation is its *bi-partisanship*. That it has both strong support from the overwhelmingly Democratic legislature in Massachusetts and the promise of a signature by the governor, who is a Republican. This legislation appears to be a true hybrid, one that is neither ideologically conservative nor ideologically liberal in its tone. It is an example of what I think of as "thinking outside the box." Although only time will tell if the plan will be effective, it is a clear, honest attempt to bring about fresh thinking, fresh ideas to an old, serious and seemingly intractable problem in this country, that is, the crumbling of our health-care system.

Why it is relevant to me today is that I hope that this same type of innovative thinking will prevail. Although we have more modest issues that we deal with, these are still important issues about the changing nature of university employment and the changing nature of governance in universities. I would hope what comes out of this would be best practices, would be a model that we would be happy with when sharing with other universities around the nation, both in respect to well-being and in respect to governance in general.

However, the promise of spring also brings with it the promise or the threat of storm clouds. Indeed there is a cloud hanging over the University of Akron this spring in the form of the Charles Plinton case. Everyone on campus that I have talked to and everyone in the community that I have talked to are deeply troubled and concerned by this case as well as its multiple aspects. The judicial hearing process and what is required for evidence, as well as the training procedure, the fact that a paid criminal informant was placed in the dorms by a police agency and an underlying, less discussed issue and that is one of race. The potential for this issue to create harm in race relations on campus and between the University and the African-American community and the local community is serious unless we applaud the appointment of Senator Fowler to chair a commission. In his remarks today, the President will announce the other appointments on this Commission. Again, we applaud these.

The Senate will also participate indirectly in this Commission's work by having members on a university committee that will support the Commission's investigation. The individuals from the Senate are being contacted; once they have been contacted and agree to serve, we will let you know who they are.

In addition to this support, the Senate also has an obligation to exercise our legislative oversight in recommending roles and, in particular, by looking at the By-laws governing the student judicial hearings and in recommending changes. Our By-laws include the empowerment to formulate rules for student conduct. We should take this role very seriously. In fact, there will be a motion that is brought to this body by petition of ten senators to have the Senate look at these rules in general.

This will be introduced and discussed at the end of New Business. In all of these cases, it is hoped that the investigation will lead to reform, rethinking and reconstitution of our practices as *best practices*. With that hope, I wish you a good spring.

Before I close my remarks, as is our custom for Fall and Spring, when the graduation lists are out, I would ask if there is any objection to suspending the rules to vote on Spring graduation lists of the University. If there are no such objections, the Chair will entertain a motion to approve the graduation lists for the Spring semester." (*Senator Lyons moved; the motion was seconded by Senator Kreidler and the body responded unanimously in favor of approving the Spring graduation lists.*) "Thank you very much and I will turn the meeting over now to Senator Konet."

IV. Reports

a. the   Executive Committee – Senator Konet stated that there were two brief announcements. "As Chair Fenwick said, we have completed a search for a new Administrative Assistant for the Faculty Senate Office and a recommendation is being forwarded so you will be introduced to this person very soon, hopefully at the next meeting.

Also a reminder that the spring election process is underway. Each of the colleges needing to elect will receive a memo with the pertinent information in the next day or two. Just as a reminder, the results of the elections, *including the number of votes cast for each candidate*, should be sent to the Senate office by May 1 so that the Executive Committee can certify those elections and then make appointments to the various committees.

The Executive Committee met with the President and Provost on March 23 to discuss the following items. The first topic, as Chair Fenwick indicated, was a lengthy discussion concerning the student judicial process. There is a great deal of concern across campus about the process and the President has informed EC that a Commission is being assembled to review it. In addition to the Commission, there will be a committee made up of members from the University community that will support the efforts of this Commission and its investigations. The Executive Committee recommended the appointment of Faculty Senators to a support committee and the Administration has agreed and is in the process of naming those Senators following EC's suggestions.

The Executive Committee shared with the President and Provost that the *Ad hoc* Committee on Decision-Making would be bringing their conclusions and recommendations to the Senate meeting today. You should have received this material on the list-serve; there are also printed copies available for your reference. This item will be discussed in more detail under the 'New Business' section of today's meeting.

Finally, the Executive Committee inquired about the results of the customer satisfaction surveys that were conducted by various units in summer 2005. The data was collected and returned to the originating units; however, it was determined that although some information could be gleaned from the report, the response rates were low and the surveys were conducted in an inconsistent manner, therefore making it difficult to use the data in a meaningful way. The process will be reviewed in order to review the survey instrument and the data collection technique for the next round. That concludes the Executive Committee report."

Hearing no questions, the Chair introduced the President.

b. Remarks by the President - President Proenza thanked the Chair and began his remarks. "As Professor Fenwick has so aptly spoken to the issues that we have been confronting, let me move directly to the matter of the Commission because, indeed, he has reflected much of the same tone that I had hoped to do. As I mentioned in my March 15 message to the campus, I am forming a Commission together with the Board of Trustees to review our student disciplinary and campus law enforcement policies and practices so as to *better* address these issues and not fall complacently into the possible elements that led to this unfortunate situation.

As you already know, the Commission is being headed by the Reverend Dr. Ronald J. Fowler. He is, as you perhaps know, a very important member of this community; he is the Pastor of the Arlington Church of God. The other Commission members as of this moment are prominent citizen and attorney, Rob Briggs, Executive Director of the GAR Foundation and Vice Chairman of the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. I think many of you know of Mr. Briggs' involvement in our community; also Barbara Mathews, Senior Vice President and Manager of Public Affairs for FirstMerit Bank, and an alumnus of the University of Akron; Fred Zuch, a retired Summit County prosecutor who has significant experience in law enforcement and teaches part-time at the University; faculty member, J. Dean Carro, Professor of Law and President-elect of the Akron Bar Association; faculty member, Linda Subich, Professor of Psychology and Associate Director of that Department; faculty member, John Queener, Psychologist and Associate Professor of Education; student trustee, Elizabeth Kovac, an Honors' College student majoring in Business. We are moving through a list of graduate students and I will name a graduate student to the Commission as well.

As Rose Marie and Rudy have apprised you, we will have a special group of University staff and faculty to support the work of the Commission, including some members of the University Operations Advisory Committee. In addition, the Board of Trustees and the Alumni Association will work with me to designate one individual each to serve as a liaison to the Commission. I am hopeful that the Commission will start to meet in the next week or so and I've asked them to make periodic reports to me and, hopefully, finalize their conclusions by the end of the summer. But I am hopeful that we will have some feedback to provide our campus and more general community before we close the semester.

I want to thank several of you, both in the Senate and throughout the campus, for the important input and counsel that you provided. So let me extend that thanks through you to your colleagues.

Let me just turn to a couple of other points for the day and then entertain any questions you may have. As you may know, Team NEO, a regional business alliance to support economic development, recently named Dr. Thomas Waltermire, the former CEO and Chairman of PolyOne Corporation, to be their new CEO. I am very pleased not only because Mr. Waltermire is an honorary alumnus of the University of Akron; a citizen of Akron—he resides here in Akron—but also because, in leading up to that appointment, he and I had discussed his possible involvement with the University of Akron. I am pleased to advise you that Mr. Waltermire has agreed to work with us on

a part-time basis—at no cost, by the way—concentrating on areas of business training and entrepreneurship of technology transfer and further advancement of our polymer efforts. As you may know, PolyOne is, of course, a strong polymer company.

In keeping with the metaphor of 'gathering storm', I would remind you that there is a very important document that is indeed forming the base of quite a bit of national attention and legislative action in our Congress; that is the report of the National Academy of Sciences entitled, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm." I reported on this previously; just let me restate a little bit of that because it is so significant. Suffice it to say that from a number of quarters, a confluence of consensus, if you wish, is forming and that consensus was very aptly expressed, I think, in that report of the National Academies. All twenty-two—if I am remembering correctly—recommendations are part of the protecting America's competitive edge legislation, Senate Bills 2196, 2197, and 2198 in the U.S. Senate, which markedly provides for the enhancement of science, technology, mathematics, and engineering education. It also provides marked increases in the support of research funding to the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Department of Energy, as well as for some, again in keeping with Rudy's remarks, important regulatory reform that would help our nation address some of these points.

Within Ohio there is one gathering cloud that I think it makes sense for us to observe and that is the proposed tax expenditure limitation that, at least at the present time, is *still* intending to be on the ballot as an amendment to the Ohio Constitution. That legislation would limit annual increases in government spending to no more than 3.5 percent or the cost of living, the inflationary rates. In some respects I think it's a very important point.

By the way, according to our own Bliss Institute who surveyed potential voters, there is widespread support for limiting government expenditure. On the other hand, from the perspective of those of us that have been at the hind end of the government *largess*—higher education—one would wonder as to whether these expenditures are limited by agency or even by line item—whether we would ever be able to catch up to other states, even with a supportive Legislature. Thus, I think a lot of people are raising solid questions. I see some of our colleagues who work on the statewide Faculty Senate and, of course, a couple of you who are in the Law School and, as is often the case, reasonable minds differ as to how to interpret well-intended language. When Secretary of State Blackwell says what he intends, it sounds very reasonable. He tells you that he means that this would be a cap on *aggregate* expenditures not on individual line items. In other words that aggregated, appropriated State dollars could not grow at more than the 3.5 percent or the rate of inflation. That means that, under such a circumstance, the Legislature could choose to cap at zero, for example, prisons and corrections and raise higher education by ten percent. However, other people are not reading the language that he's proposed in that way. A prominent editorial in the *Plain Dealer* suggested that even Ohio State's football team, that doesn't have any appropriated dollars would be held to the 3.5 percent or inflationary increase limitation. If anything will get the Legislature's attention, by the way, it's Ohio State football.

I ask that all of you who follow these matters and, certainly, Rudy as you follow with the Ohio Faculty Council, please keep your eye on those issues. For those of you who do read the language

with a good eye to interpretations, please provide your thoughts on it. There are a lot of people who are immediately opposed; others are very aggressively championing it, so I think we need to watch that carefully.

I can tell you that the Board of Regents is scheduling a special state-wide trustees conference for June 6—evening of the 5th and June 6th—to examine this in greater detail and to discuss this directly with whoever the two gubernatorial candidates are that emerge through that process, Mr. Strickland on one hand and Mr. Petro or Mr. Blackwell on the other side.

Finally, I think you are aware that in the last ten days a very large number of our students participated in relief efforts to the citizens in the areas in Mississippi and Louisiana that were affected by Hurricane Katrina. About 150 of our students together with many others in the community spent a full week working at Christian Pass, Mississippi. Great feedback from them, great enthusiasm, excitement and a sense of participation in creating well-being. I wanted to have us collectively recognize this great effort on the part of our students, staff and faculty. There have been some very good news reports, both printed and TV.

I also want to recognize our College of Education who provided physical education equipment to a middle school in Pascagoula, Mississippi. Professor Kathy Owens and her husband delivered this much-needed equipment during that spring break. Many others contributed to these relief efforts through projects, donations and in-kind services. Indeed this is the sort of effort that reflects well on us in every regard.

On a very wonderful note, students not only continue in this way to distinguish themselves, but our Engineering students, about two weeks ago, won over schools like MIT, etc., in Houston on a robotized lunar rover vehicle that they constructed. This competition now has to be redesigned because the problem that this competition had been attempting to solve was solved by our students. So those of you in Engineering—wherever you are—congratulations to your students again.

Colleagues, thank you. I'll be happy to entertain any questions you may have."

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any questions or comments for the President?

Senator Gerlach remarked that "the President might be well advised to consider drawing on some of our Retirees Association members on this investigation about our student disciplinary code. The reason I say this is that some of us, from years past, had direct experience in working with the student disciplinary boards. I served several times myself. If my memory is correct and unless things have changed since I retired, the rule I thought we always followed was don't interfere with any student standing if a case was in Court. The case in Court pretty well decided things. If the court said, 'innocent,' any Student Disciplinary Board that I was ever involved in did not proceed with any further disciplinary action one way or the other. That seemed to be our 'rule of thumb' and I thought written well into our procedures. Maybe I was mistaken, but that's my memory.

I would suggest that perhaps if he was of a mind to draw on the knowledge of a retiree—not me, mind you, sir! I'm not asking for a job—but perhaps to ask our Retirees President, Mrs. Pomerenke for some help, maybe we could lend a hand, too, and dig out from our memories and our papers some recollections that would be of help. Please consider it."

The President acknowledged that it would be much appreciated.

Hearing no other questions or comments, the Chair moved to a report from the Well-being Committee.

c. Remarks by the Provost: (*The Provost was unable to attend the day's meeting.*)

d. Well-being Committee – Senator Erickson stated that the Well-Being Committee had met once and that there were three items to report.   There was an update from Benefits Administration on enrollment; fewer people enrolled in SuperMed Plus given the change in hospitals.   It was also noted that there have been an unusually large number of complaints about the Spectra Vision Plan. Senator Erickson asked that if you have any problems, to please let her know.   She stated that HR can assist with contacts to Spectra in order to solve some of the problems.

The Senator reported that one of the agenda items for the next Wellness sub-committee meeting would be to explore initiatives being implemented at other universities. One of the initiatives is a screening program with incentives, currently being conducted at Kent State.   The committee is looking at whether or not something similar could be developed here at this University.

Regarding the charge that Senate gave the subcommittee in December to look at the future of the Well-being Committee, the committee has reviewed a draft framework that has revealed several questions. In order for those questions to be addressed and answered, the Administration and AAUP representatives need to be involved in the discussion. However, it was not possible to convene a meeting of all the participants prior to the Senate meeting. Senator Erickson reported that as Chair of the committee she had contacted Dr. Chand Midha who is working on the issue for the Administration and Senator Linda Barrett who is a member of the AAUP negotiating team. She concluded her report by asking if there were any questions.

Hearing no questions, Chair Fenwick asked the body if they had any objections to suspending the rules in order to hear a brief report from the *Ad hoc* Facilities Planning Committee.   Dr. Sterns, Chair of the committee was unable to attend, however, Senator Erickson would present the report in his absence.

e. *Ad hoc* Facilities Planning Report - Senator Erickson reported that Dr. Sterns would be calling an *Ad hoc* Facilities Planning Committee meeting in the next few weeks. For those on the committee, it was noted that an issue of serious concern relating to parking would be discussed. An article in *The Buchtelite* stated that the parking deck under Auburn Science would be closed in order to build an expansion of the Engineering College. This closing would result in a loss of 230 parking places, including those for special events at the Student Center. The loss of these spaces in addition

to those lost outside Folk Hall is creating some concern about parking availability in the western part of campus. Dr. Sterns noted that the original site set aside for an additional parking deck on the west side has since been used for another building. The Committee plans to call a meeting of all interested parties to discuss this issue and will have a report at the May Senate meeting.

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any questions.

Senator John asked if the Auburn Science deck was completely closing or just partially? He understood it was just partially closing.

Senator Erickson responded that the plan was to close the entire deck although it had not yet gone out for bid.

Senator Londraville interjected with a correction saying that Level A was dedicated to Engineering. But Levels B, C, D and E were dedicated to Biology and that this had gone to bid. The department was to sign off on the architectural plan in the next month.

President Proenza provided some additional information. "There is still room for a west campus deck; the portion that is occupied by the Engineering test building does not compromise the original plan which involved tiering up the hillside, so there's room there. In addition, Mr. Curtis and his staff are looking for three other sites, one of which is on the east part of the campus and would accommodate approximately 1100 spaces. In the meantime, property that is being acquired is being turned into parking space, so it would be helpful if you visit with Mr. Stafford and Mr. Curtis."

Senator Erickson stated that was exactly the point, to have a meeting with Mr. Curtis and Mr. Stafford on the whole issue so that it could all be sorted out, so that everyone would know what is going on and so that concerns could be addressed.

President Proenza thanked Senator Erickson for her input.

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, the Chair, called himself out of order saying "The Provost isn't here today so I assumed that she didn't have any remarks, but then I remembered that Associate Provost Dukes is sitting in the back. Does the Provost's Office have any comments?"

Associate Provost Dukes replied "I am here for decoration today!" He stated that there were no comments from the Provost's Office.

President Proenza then excused himself saying "Well, since I am therefore superfluous decoration, I will bid you a 'happy spring day.'"

V. <u>Unfinished Business</u> – Moving to unfinished business, Chair Fenwick stated "Now we can get down to serious business. I want to report, from what I've heard from Senator Rich who is Chair of the Reference Committee, that yesterday they had a meeting or *were going to have a meeting* to look into the motion regarding absences and expulsion from Senate. Only one person got back in touch with Senator Rich, which was Senator Gerlach, who, due unfortunately to a prior commitment, couldn't attend. Ironically, the Senate committee that's looking into Senate absences and what to do about that policy, were unexcused absences. So we will try again so that we can have a report out by May. The Chair encourages those people who are on the Reference Committee to contact Senator Rich, because I think there are going to be other issues in the coming months that the Reference Committee will also need to deal with."

VI. <u>New Business</u> – Chair Fenwick stated there were going to be two items of 'New Business.' But before getting to the motion, he turned the chair over once again to Senator Erickson to give the final report of the Senate *Ad hoc* Decision Making Committee.

Senator Erickson reported that the *Ad hoc* Committee on Decision Making had met on several occasions and had come up with a final report, conclusion, and recommendation. She indicated that there were copies of the report available on the handout table and that she would be referring only to the changes made in the report since the last meeting. She stated that some of the changes were simple things, but very important ones such as making sure that everyone appeared on the list and that all names were spelled correctly.

The changes made since the last report appear in three places. One is the suggested structure of the committee, not a change in the structure itself, but in the explanation of it and in the visual representation of it. Referring to the chart on the back of the report, Senator Erickson stated that people didn't seem to understand what was being suggested. As a result, the structure was designed in two pieces like the outer and inner parts of a wheel. On the outside of the wheel would be the organizations representing each of the constituencies on campus: Faculty Senate consisting of full-time faculty, bargaining and non-bargaining units, part-time and retired; CPAC, representing contract professionals; SEAC, representing staff; Student Government representing undergraduate and graduate students; Council of Deans representing deans; and Chairs, representing department chairs.

The intent is that each constituent organization would have its own responsibilities with its own standing committees. "That means, essentially, if we consider ourselves as a faculty senate, our committee structures essentially stand unless we look at them and say, 'gee, do we want to change them in some way."

The second part of the circle shows project chart committees, those committees that are limited, time-specific task committees. Senator Erickson stated that this was where some of the differences began to show up. "We started thinking how to make this a circle, because what's important about this circle is the link between each of these in that outside ring. It's not just spokes going out, there are links around. The idea would be that each of the standing chart committees could call on

another organization for additional members of their committee. We found in the Decision-Making Task Force that, on some issues relating to Academic Policies, some of the front-line people involved with implementing Academic Policies are contract professionals and staff. Well, then Academic Policies can call on those people to be members of that committee so that they can deal with those kinds of issues."

The idea is to allow as much communication as possible between constituencies relating to issues that might be a major responsibility of one, but where other constituencies on the front-line have important input. This is one of the issues that this structure is hoping to address.

Activities directly relating to bargaining units are not included in organizations and committees since those come under the legal framework specific to those units. This is the governance structure that relates to the units that are outside those bargaining unit activities.

"In the center of the wheel is what we call the University Senate. The function of the Senate—of *that* Senate—would be to provide input into activities that are relevant to *all* constituent groups. That is, planning, budgeting, physical facilities, enrollment management; there are many others, but these are the ones that we could clearly see. An example today is parking. We don't have any such university-wide committee anymore, but we have a problem related to this whole issue of parking. It may be that it's all planned out and it's just a matter of communication, but that is what many people have said. In fact, I think it was Senator Huff who said last time that the activities of the Facilities Planning Committee that we used to have were really good at dealing with issues precisely like this and it took in all sorts of people across campus—students, faculty, staff, contract professionals, everybody. Those are the functions that would go into that senate group.

The same thing goes for planning and budgeting. You may say, 'but isn't that what the planning and budgeting group did?' Yes. But we're not going to be able to reconstruct what we used to have, in the form that we had it. So let's look at it from a different viewpoint; as we say later, 'it's the function that matters.' The function is that we—and everybody that it represents, the Senate, the faculty, SEAC, CPAC, the students, both graduate and undergraduate—if you want input into these kinds of activities, that's the level where we figure we can *all* do that. Do our people need to be involved in that level of decision making? Yes. Probably. They were in the budget committee; we also had representatives to the Administration through the Council of Deans. And, of course, as you know, we also in those days had department chairs on the Senate. Well, we can't have the institutional structure we had before, why can't we come up with something that maybe is better but deals with those functions?

The Senate would consist of yet-unspecified number of elected members from the organizations which represent each of the major constituent groups on campus. At this stage the thought is that an *ad hoc* committee would be a smaller number; it's not a case of putting everyone all together as a committee…as an organization. We thought it would be a smaller group to allow flexibility although we also considered that there could also be a general assembly of the elected members of *all* the constituent organizations each semester. All we have here is a starting point of a structure.

The second change is *why we're going to do this*. I said that people don't really understand what's going on here. So people talked and talked and this is what they came up with. The objectives have not changed since they were originally developed."

Senator Erickson read from the report.

These objectives reflect our concerns that, at the present time, many constituency groups feel they have no real voice in the significant decisions made on campus, although they have important front-line input to contribute and important understanding of the University to share.

We also agree with the communications audit and the DMREM Task Force that there are serious issues of communication on campus. These are especially severe from grassroots, up, but occur equally across constituencies.

"And that's part of the important communication issue—from top, down. The vision of shared governance found in what was called the 'Faculty Senate,' but was for all intents and purposes a 'University Senate'. It represented most of the other constituencies but was destroyed in August 2003 and the Senate we have now has purely academic functions.

These functions are essential and we all know how important they are, but they don't allow us input into equally significant areas of University policy, all of which relate to the understanding of the academic mission of the university, which was our first objective.

Those decisions will *only* be made effective with input from all who serve and understand the University; we want to achieve a form of governance that deals with all the problems of *lack of input* and *lack of communication*, and as we talked about last time, to form an *influential, effective Senate*.

If you turn over to the last page, you will find our conclusion and recommendation." Senator Erickson read the conclusion.

The conclusion of the Ad hoc Committee on Decision-Making is that building a University Senate model is the preferred method for answering the recommendations of the DMRE Task Force. We also recommend that a committee be convened with an equal number of representatives from all participating constituencies to continue to explore the University Senate model described in the report. We recommend that members of each constituency should choose their representatives by election or other democratic means.

Senator Erickson reported that this was the recommendation the Committee sent forward to the EC over the summer. She reminded the body that this is also what the Chair was saying earlier, this is an effort to try to start to rebuild trust, innovate, to come up with a more inclusive discussion of governance. This is the time to do this because NCA will be visiting in April 2008, and *governance* was one of the major issues that they said they want to review.

Chair Fenwick asked for questions or comments.

Senator Gerlach remarked that "'the devil is in the details.' I was wondering about this business of a University Senate at the center of the circle, made up of how many people? I understood and read that. There is where the problem is going to arise. Then there's this talk about possibly a general assembly including all the members of all the groups once a semester. That is all very good and well, but you know the way I see it, after years of going through University Council, the beginnings of this Senate—which I chaired the first year—the rub is what the Trustees did to us by destroying our various committees. Therein lies our remedy."

Chair Fenwick questioned "Destroy the trustees?"

Senator Gerlach replied strongly, "'V' for Vendetta! No, if we could somehow persuade the Trustees that with the North Central Association's impending visit, they would be well advised to backtrack on what they did to our governance system. Because if we had these functions back that they took away from us, a good deal of the problem we face now would be answered.

This other thing is just another business of spinning wheels, engaging all kinds of activity, and what it will result in I cannot for the life of me imagine. Then if you do this, you'll still have to get the Trustee's permission to put it into motion, won't you? I think we would be just as well advised to do something, to plan some ways and means of getting the Trustees to restore our functions here. Maybe we should, in addition, provide a certain number of seats in this body for the Council of Deans and Department Chairs. We should perhaps allow department chairmen to be elected to the Senate, as once they were.

There are all kinds of possibilities, but I'm just ruminating here in suggesting that this business is very interesting, but I think it involves a way of getting *around* what the Trustees did, but in the end you're going to have to face them again. Anything that you propose, if I were to insert any efforts at all, I would say let us work the other way. Say, 'please restore our functions or you're going to get into trouble with the North Central."

Senator Stratton commented that "There is no doubt that the Trustees will have the final word, but I think what the Committee was trying to do this summer was say that the Task Force said what we *had* wasn't working very well and we needed to find another way. Over the summer, we learned that some constituencies on campus didn't think that the *old* way worked very well either. So what we did is we tried to compare the institutions that seemed to have some of the best practices that we were able to look at and to try to merge it in a way that we *think* will work well in the environment in which we operate. We have to recognize that. So what we've done is say, 'here are some of the decision-making groups on campus that we think are important and had real input into important decisions that need to be made on the campus.' What we have here is a starting point, a way to get discussion going, not only among *this* Faculty Senate, but between this decision-making body and others on campus to see if, indeed, we can come up with a new way of sharing our input, sharing our expertise, sharing our points of view in a way that will better the institution as a whole. That's the point.

The Committee that will be appointed, if we decide to do that, will use this as a starting point and talk with these other constituencies to see how they feel about what would be a good way for them to have input into these kinds of campus-wide decisions. As I see it, each one of these individual decision-making units will continue to have input into those areas that are unique to their interests. We would have a faculty senate made up of faculty members who would have input into our unique contributions. Where the University Senate comes in and where this outer circle comes in is what happens if our interests happen to be aligned with another group on campus? Currently we have no formal mechanism by which we can combine together to have a combined input into the decision-making process. This structure at least is a beginning point to try to give us that formal structure that we can combine and cooperate together on those issues where we have a common interest."

Senator Rich commented, "It seems to me that the previous two speakers made very valid points. I'm not sure they are really incompatible. The problems that the Faculty Senate has encountered in the wake of the controversy over the union election and so forth are ones that neither this structure nor any other can fix. Senator Gerlach is exactly right; it's a matter of whether the Board of Trustees can be persuaded to reallocate decision-making or recommendatory power that previously was vested in the Faculty Senate. I think there's no way around that. Now this kind of effort may actually lead to the Board taking a fresh look at that and, in that case, it might actually be the opportunity to bring that about. But whether that would happen depends on the will of the Board of Trustees; it's not something really within our power. I also think it is important to recognize that the Faculty Senate has, in many ways, always been and increasingly become a conceptually muddled institution—I don't mean that about any of its members. If I can explain, it's that in part it makes decisions that pertain specifically to academic policy but it is a body that consists not only of the faculty, but others as well and understandably since it addresses other subjects that are of concern to everyone. So we end up in an odd position where the Senators who are members of the University staff, vote on who should graduate this year or other matters of academic policy. This has never in reality been a problem, but it is conceptually a little messy.

So what I *do* like about this model is that it separates out those functions or at least has the promise of separating out those functions and I think there's that to be said for it. Not that it will solve the problems that Senator Gerlach has correctly observed, although the whole process may provide the occasion for us to take another look at it, but that it may straighten out some of the messiness that has occurred over time, especially as legitimate requests have been made for increased representation in the Senate. We've moved from something that was never purely a faculty senate, but was closer to it, to something that is gradually approximating the old University Council, from which the Faculty Senate was intended to be a departure. In the end it seems to me that both of these concerns are legitimate and perhaps could be addressed in this process."

Senator Kreidler stated that she wished to "speak very strongly about supporting our Committee. When I look at the faces here and I think about committee after committee, this is a very [hard] working group. If people met through the summer and if they have put themselves into being on this committee and have presented this to us, I think that, yes, it is very good to say, 'have you thought of this?' or 'have you thought of that?' There needs to be real support for the people that

bring these things to us. If there's something that you have experience with, then you say, 'have you thought of this?' that's different. But if you say, 'hey, go back to the drawing board,' I think that's so defeatist and I think that really gives people a feeling of 'why should I be on a committee, nobody's going to listen anyway; we have no power.' So, to me, the way to get power is to say, 'okay, our colleagues have looked at this; they have spent time with this, how can I support, how can I be part of that?' and move on from there. So I'm saying I would like to support the Committee."

Chair Fenwick remarked that the discussion could continue. However, he suggested that the body move to a discussion of the resolution coming from the Executive Committee regarding the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Decision-Making Committee. "Before we can put this motion on the floor, though, according to Senate By-laws, a motion coming from committee must be presented to the Senate at least a week in advance. This obviously was not done. Yet a majority of the Senate can override that provision. I would just simply ask if there is any objection to presenting this motion. If there is an objection, then we will take a vote.

Are there any objections? (*None were indicated*.) Okay, then the Chair will make the decision that this resolution is in order. Senator Konet, will you read the resolution? This resolution comes from committee."

Senator Konet:

WHEREAS, the Ad Hoc Decision Making Committee appointed by EC recommends that a committee be convened to explore the University Senate model of shared governance described in their report, and

WHEREAS, the Ad Hoc Decision Making Committee recommends that an equal number of representatives be chosen from each constituency for this committee and

WHEREAS, the Ad Hoc Decision Making Committee recommends that these representatives be chosen by a democratic method,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate accept the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee that a committee, to be known as the University Senate Exploratory Committee, be convened to explore the University Senate model outlined in their report, and

BE IT THEN RESOLVED that the members of the University Senate Exploratory Committee be selected by a democratic process from among the following constituencies (two members per constituency): sitting Faculty Senators with faculty rank, CPAC, SEAC, Council of Deans, Department Chairs, and Associated Student Government, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate Executive Committee appoint the two Senators with faculty rank to serve on the University Senate Exploratory Committee and that these two appointments be subject to the consent of the Faculty Senate,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the chair of the Faculty Senate convene the first meeting of representatives from interested groups.

The Chair remarked that "Since this comes from committee, it needs no second. Is there any discussion on the motion?"

Senator Mann stated **"**Just in case this does make it through and the Board of Trustees does approve it, listed under the constituent organizations is Graduate Student Government, which represents the 5,000 graduate students. We're also listed on the little chart. In the actual motion itself, it only lists the Associated Student Government, which is the *undergraduate* students. Could I move to include graduate students?"

Chair Fenwick stated that he could make a motion to include Graduate Student Government to complement ASG and asked if there was a second to the amendment? (*Senator Norfolk seconded the motion*.) He then asked for discussion on the amendment to add Graduate Student Government.

Senator Stratton requested clarification. "As I understand the motion, there's supposed to be an equal number from the groups. Is the Graduate council supposed to be a separate group, or is it one of the two student representatives? That's just a point of clarification."

Senator Mann interpreted what he saw in the chart. "From looking at the chart, I would think that there would be two, for a combined graduate and undergraduate students. It has both of us [the groups] listed together in the circle, so I would imagine one representative from graduate and one representative from undergraduate. That way the representation from all the students on the campus could be displayed in this University Senate.

Chair Fenwick clarified "Okay, so it would in effect be one representative from ASG and one from graduate students?"

Senator Mann confirmed this.

Chair Fenwick asked for further discussion on this motion?

Senator Londraville questioned "Does the Administration know about this idea and sanction the Exploratory Committee? The reason I am asking is, if you ask a Dean to be on this committee, are they potentially being disloyal to the Administration by sitting on it?"

Senator Erickson replied that the Administration has been aware of work of the *ad hoc* Committee. "When we got to this point, CPAC and SEAC asked us to ask the President whether or not he

would object to their participation in such a committee. The President and Provost both said no they would not object. We didn't ask that question at that time with respect to deans and department chairs but the President said no, he did not object.

Senator Kreidler reminded the body that there was an amendment on the floor.

Chair Fenwick agreed and asked if there were any other comments related to the amendment.

Senator Aller addressed Senator Erickson with her question. "Is it your intention to only have one representative from the Graduate Student Government and one from undergrad?"

Senator Kingsbury followed up by saying "In the wording of the resolution, it said two members from each constituency. I would see Associated Student Government and Graduate Student Government as two separate entities rather than one and the same in terms of their structure.

Chair Fenwick replied that "The amendment is *one* each, I believe. Senator Mann, is that your intent?"

Senator Mann replied "Actually, that's a point that I cannot necessarily speak to, I did not sit on the *Ad hoc* Committee, so I'm uncertain exactly what their intentions were. I was wanting to clarify with Senator Stratton as far as my personal idea of what they were speaking to because they had both of us in the same circle [on the organizational chart]. Although, on the other hand, it is a valid point that we are a different constituency, with different ideas, different needs, and different perspectives than the undergraduate students."

Chair Fenwick asked "What was the intent of your motion in terms of numbers?"

Senator Mann replied that he simply wanted to be put on the senate in terms of representation.

Senator Gehani commented "Am I to understand that there might be flavors of differences in the needs of graduate and undergraduate students. So could we say that we need different representation from full professors, associates, and others? When I look at this chart, I think a council of species. I think students are one species, and another species, and going into sub-species. Then we would have a very large group and that would be the *University*."

Senator Stachowiak clarified "we're just voting on a committee to investigate. This is not the final mix of this creation of University Senate; this is just to research this. We're wasting time trying to muddle on how many numbers we have here. Just put two of everybody in there and let them talk. Get something done. I hate to sound like 'Larry the Cable Guy.'"

Chair Fenwick commented "Actually, you sound like 'Noah the Ark Guy.'"

Senator Jeantet commented "Looking at the structure it appears to be all-inclusive. But one has to wonder. You've got the faculty represented in one *chunk*; then you have two *chunks* of staff employees and contract professionals; you have two *chunks* of administration. The faculty, if any-

thing, is one-sixth. Students and faculty together, who seem to me—pardon my prejudice—seem to be the *University*, represent only one-third of the constituent groups. So this is something that the Committee would have to consider is that perhaps a proportionate representation that might better reflect what we, altogether, might want."

Senator Stratton suggested "that since the work of this committee is likely to take place over the summer, that it might be a good idea to have *two* undergraduate students and *two* graduate students in the hope that at least one of them would be able to make it given their schedules. I don't know about you, but when I was a student, it was hard sometimes to do these kinds of things over the summertime. So I would be in support of having two undergrads and two grads on the Committee."

Chair Fenwick asked if Senator Stratton wanted to make that an amendment to an amendment? "The nature of the amendment now is simply to add Graduate Student Government to the list without number. Or do you want to leave it in the future?"

Senator Stratton replied "As I understand the amendment, it simply is to add Graduate Student Government as one of the constituencies. My original point of clarification was to ask if you wanted to be included as a single constituency with the undergraduates. If you need, I would make an amendment to the amendment that indicates that the Graduate student council be a *separate* entity for the Committee's purposes."

Chair Fenwick asked for a second to that motion. (*Senator Mann seconded it*.)

"Is there discussion on the amendment to the amendment?"

Senator Rich, "We keep talking in terms of what our intentions are. We're passing a resolution; what matters is not what our individual thoughts are; what matters is what we *say*-—the words of the resolution. So let's just word the resolution the way we want it, to mean what we want it to mean, so that when somebody looks at it later, they will understand what we meant and not have to call us up and ask us. So if I understand correctly, what is being proposed, all we need to do is add GSG to the enumeration of constituencies in the resolution. Is that not correct?

Senator Stratton concurred and stated "I am willing to withdraw my amendment." (*Senator Mann withdrew his second.*)

Chair Fenwick then went back to the amendment to just add Graduate Student Government. "Any other discussion on this amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor of adding 'Graduate Student Government' to the list of constituencies, please say, 'aye.' (*The majority of the Senate was in favor of this; there was one opposed.*) The amendment carries and we're back to the main motion."

Senator Gerlach, referring to the back sheet about the conclusion and recommendation, stated "I am muddled up because there seems to be a difference between the language here and what Secretary Konet read out to us in the 'detailed specifications.' This point says: "An equal number of representatives of all participating constituencies.""

Another Senator referred Senator Gerlach to the motion on a separate piece of paper.

Upon finding the correct motion, Senator Gerlach then asked "What has happened to the University Association of Retirees? We are a separate constituency in this body as it now consists, but we are not so regarded except as being just a part of the Faculty Senate, according to the new enumeration. Am I correct in understanding or am I confused?"

Senator Erickson responded. "When we listed out the faculty senators, I read out from the report the description that was given in the report. The description in the report saw the Retirees, as you represent retired faculty—not retired staff but retired faculty. As retired faculty, you are representatives of the faculty senate; that was your place, just as part-time *faculty* are in faculty, so it was—whether you were bargaining unit or non-bargaining unit—they were *faculty* and that was the designation as part of the *faculty senate.* That's the 'species,' I believe, that we are all faculty *species*."

Senator Gerlach then concluded, "In other words, if this proceeds, Mr. Chairman, this Senate will elect so many members to the Exploratory Committee—*two*. That depends on whether either one of us gets chosen or not. I guess that's fair enough because it's a large body. I do think it's a little out of proportion here because the largest single group represented here in this body is the *faculty*—not the students and not the other groups. I don't know even in this Exploratory Committee if you should limit the number of faculty to serve on this study group to only two. I think there are more people who ought to be included than just two. I wonder if any of the other members of this body have any sentiment agreeable to this. I don't want to pose anything out of line. I'm not certain how many I would propose. Does anyone else have any observations on this before I try anything?"

Senator Rich sympathized with Senator Gerlach's concerns. "It seems to me that there are too few faculty. Or maybe I just have a faculty-centric view of the University. I would be supportive of a motion to amend or increase the number of faculty representatives to perhaps four."

Senator Gerlach proceeded with a motion. "Mr. Chairman, I will try a motion with a bit more. I move that there be *six*".

Chair Fenwick asked for a second to that motion? Hearing no second, the motion died.

Senator Norfolk raised a concern. "If you change it to two, then you've got to rewrite this whole darn thing."

Chair Fenwick corrected. "If you change it *from* two?"

Senator Norfolk agreed. "Yes, because it says 'two members per constituency.' You can't suddenly…you'll have to rewrite the whole structure."

Senator Gerlach felt that was possible by inserting "…with the exception of the Senate, which will have four." I'll make a motion to *that* effect. Just put in there, "two from all with the exception of the Senate, from which there shall be four."

Senator Kreidler interjected saying "Excuse me, but that's not what we're voting on. We're voting on an Exploratory Committee."

Senator Gerlach responded "We know that. We want more exploration from the faculty."

Chair Fenwick posed a question on that motion. "If you say, 'four from the Faculty Senate,' that could include anybody that sits on the Faculty Senate, including members of SEAC, CPAC, ASG."

Senator Gerlach suggested changing it to 'Faculty members of the Faculty Senate'.

Senator John raised a question. "The third paragraph: 'we vote two members on.' Two of them are from the sitting Faculty Senate, correct? Then the next paragraph goes into where 'the Executive Committee will appoint two senators,' which are also two faculty members. Is that the same two, or two additional?"

Chair Fenwick replied that it was the same two, subject to the consent of the Faculty Senate.

Senator John wondered "How can we be voting two people then also appointing two people?"

Chair Fenwick responded that "The process of having the Senate approve, is that the Executive Committee would recommend two names to the Faculty Senate. Then the Faculty Senate would vote to approve or not approve those two people. Just like a Senate confirmation hearing. I would like to have the exact wording of Senator Gerlach and Senator Rich's motion."

Senator Gerlach indicated that he was referring to the third paragraph from the bottom. "Be it then resolved that the members of the University Senate Exploratory Committee be…"

… by a democratic process from among the following constituencies: four sitting Faculty Senators with faculty rank, two members per constituency of CPAC, SEAC, Council of Deans, Department Chairs, Associated Student Government, and Graduate Student Government.

Senator Rich referred everyone to the next paragraph saying "you need to change the 'two' to 'four.'"

> **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate Executive Committee appoint the four Senators with faculty rank to serve on the University Senate Exploratory Committee and that these four appointments be subject to the consent of the Faculty Senate…**

Senator John went back to the second paragraph from the bottom. "You're saying that 'the Executive Committee will *appoint*.' When you *appoint* someone, then you're there. It should maybe be changed to 'recommend.'"

Chair Fenwick asked if this would be a separate motion or an amendment to the amendment?

Senator Rich observed "Under Article II of the Constitution, the President *appoints* judges, other officers of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The fact that the Executive Committee is empowered to make the appointment doesn't mean that the Senate's consent is not required."

Senator Gerlach referred the Chair to the Bylaws. "If you check them, [the Bylaws] say that 'unless some other provision is made, the appointive body for committees and so on is our Executive Committee. They do the general appointments, then there are exceptions. The Senate may do its own appointments with no designation, so that's the way this works out."

Chair Fenwick concluded that "The intent is that whether we recommend or appoint, that it would be subject to the consent of this body. Does Senator John want to make a motion to amend the amendment?"

Senator John declined to make a motion.

Senator Londraville pointed out that in the second paragraph, also in the amendment, "you would have to get rid of 'an equal number of.'"

Senator Erickson interjected. "I'm sorry but the *Ad hoc Decision Making Committee* recommended and we cannot change the recommendation. That is what we recommended so I don't think we can change it."

Senator Londraville pointed out "Then as Senator Norfolk said, we would have to rewrite it? That doesn't make any sense."

Senator Norfolk disagreed. "No, that's what they recommended and here's what we're going to do."

Senator Gerlach commented "The difference between the 'WHEREAS' clause and the 'BE IT RESOLVED' clause."

Senator Stachowiak commented. "Have we got my blood pressure up or what? I think it's very egotistical for this body to say that their voice in how a simple committee trying to convene a University Senate is more important than any other faction on this campus so that they should have more representatives than any other faction on this campus. That directly speaks to the fact that 'I'm better than you are and makes for bad feelings and bad business.' Everybody should get together and have a talk. It shouldn't be so much about 'I'm representing faculty, I'm representing students, I'm representing this group, or this group, or this group. I'm representing the University of Akron and what's best for the University of Akron? It's not about 'I've got a Bachelor's degree.' Heck I knew a custodian who worked here who had a Ph.D and he was looney!

The point here is we're trying to *build* something; we're trying to make something. You don't have somebody stronger than the other person because then you have a tug of war away from what the real issue is, and that's getting along together, making something that's going to work, and then selling it to the Board of Trustees. I would suggest that rather than increasing the number of faculty senators that we go with this game plan and we build this committee, to get them together to talk and work together and make an adequate representation for later on as to how the University should look, feel and work. Without that type of cooperation, with one person more important than the other, you're not going to get everybody to work together. With equal representation from everybody, then you have a much better idea."

Senator Mann concurred. "I completely agree—100 percent—with everything you said, which is what Senator Gerlach's amendment would do. It would make equal numbers of all parties. With Associated Student Government and Graduate Student Government, that's four students; with Department Chairs and Council of Deans, that four administrators. With contract professionals and staff, that's four employees, so four faculty would make sense to balance it out. Then everything you said *would* hold true, then everyone would have equal power and there wouldn't be one group coming in weaker than all the others. That's why I would support Senator Gerlach's motion."

Senator Kreidler cheered "Hear, hear!" and Senator Rich commented "I now have nothing to add!"

Chair Fenwick commented "He [Senator Mann] is a Sociology Graduate student! Is there any other discussion of the motion or the amendment to the motion?"

Senator Mann called the question.

Chair Fenwick stated that if there was no further discussion to the amendment, the body could vote on it. He questioned if everyone was clear on what the amendment said and asked Senator Konet to read it

Senator Konet questioned if the whole motion should be read. Senators indicated that they just wanted the amended portion read

…BE IT THEN RESOLVED that the members of the University Senate Explor-atory Committee be selected by a democratic process from among the following constituencies: *four sitting members from Faculty Senators with faculty rank, two members per constituency from CPAC, SEAC, Council of Deans, Department Chairs, Associated Student Government, and Graduate Student Government.*

Then change all of the 'twos' to 'fours' in the next paragraph.

Chair Fenwick called for a vote. "Hearing no other discussion on this motion, we'll try to voice a vote. All those in favor of this motion to change representation of faculty from two to four, say 'aye.'"
(*The majority of the body voted in favor of this change; there was one opposed*.) The motion carried.

The Chair went back to the main motion. "Is there any other discussion on this main motion? Hearing no other discussion on the main motion, all those in favor of this main motion, please say, 'aye.'" (*The body responded unanimously in favor of the main motion.*) The motion carried.

VI. __New Business__ **–** Chair Fenwick stated there was one more item of business to handle before concluding the meeting. "This was brought to us be a petition signed by ten senators this afternoon. According to Senate Bylaws, Faculty Senators may bring a motion—not on the Agenda—to the Agenda with a petition of ten. This motion has to do with student disciplinary actions."

Senator Konet read the motion.
BE IT RESOLVED that student conduct and discipline is a matter of concern for all Faculty. The student disciplinary hearings are conducted by Student Judicial Affairs as stated on page 29 of the 2005-2006 Undergraduate Bulletin. The devel-opment and enforcement of Standards of Conduct of Students is an endeavor which fosters student personal and social development.
IT IS MOVED that the Faculty Senate
(1) Investigate and evaluate the processes and procedures for student disciplinary hearings, including the standards of proof. In particular, this evaluation should consider a higher standard of proof, which is a preponderance of the evidence, should be used in all disciplinary hearings or in hearings where the allegations affects the reputation of the student.
(2) That the Executive Committee have authority to establish and appoint mem-bers to an *Ad hoc* Student Discipline Procedures Committee to undertake this task.
(3) That the Executive Committee establish a timeline for the *Ad hoc* Committee tasks, with the goal of having a preliminary report presented to the Senate by October 2006.
(4) That the Executive Committee work with and coordinate with the President's Committee and Advisory Commission that are investigating matters related to

student discipline. And that the Executive Committee's charge to the *Ad hoc* Student Discipline Committee reflect the coordination *with* the President's Committee.
Respectfully submitted, April 6, 2006

Chair Fenwick stated that he had a few extra copies of this motion that he could pass out.

"Because this comes as a petition of ten senators, it does not need a second. Is there any discussion of this motion?"

Senator Norfolk questioned the need for this motion. "I would just like to say, didn't the President just set up a Commission to do this? Once again, we're trying to duplicate what someone else is doing. Why not wait?"

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any other discussion on the motion.

Senator Gerlach commented "Mr. Chairman, perhaps Senator Norfolk is correct in what he says, but I think it's time for the Senate—again—to reassert its rights as established by the Board of Trustees. That this is our business. The Student Disciplinary Code was established way back when in the turbulent 1960s and 70s and so on; it was the Council's business, it's the Senate's business now. I think it ought to put its oar in the water and row and see what can be done here. It's a way –again—of asserting a rightful jurisdiction of this body.

I have *always*, from the time I first set foot on this campus, I've always fought for the faculty's right and privilege to be involved in governance. I did it in University Council; I did it in from the beginning as the first Chairman of this Senate. And I continue to do it, I guess until I die like old John Quincy Adams who ended up his days on the floor of the House of Representatives. So may I, if it be that. Let us do this."

Senator Kushner Benson spoke in favor of the amendment. "Although I appreciate the President's efforts in forming a review committee, I note that most of the members of the committee are very well respected members of the community and, *maybe* is a 'politically correct' committee. I served on one of these disciplinary committees about three years ago. It left such a *bad* taste in my mouth; I refused to sit on any after that. I was very concerned about the so-called 'justice' that took place during that meeting; I felt like the student's rights were violated. It was an international student who, had he been expelled from the University, which is what the charges were, would have probably been deported. Fortunately, the committee members did not see much value in the charges or the evidence that was provided; the outcome was far more in favor of the student. But I never forgot that experience; I did not know what to do with it. When I read about the incident in the paper, it made me sick to my stomach that maybe if I had not spoken up sooner and put into movement a process to review that…I just don't know how many other cases besides, so I think it's worth our input."

Senator Brooks stated "My understanding is that, in addition to this 'blue ribbon' committee, that there is also supposed to be a support committee and the Executive Committee is working with the faculty members that are going to be on that."

Chair Fenwick confirmed this. "There are two that will be appointed from the faculty ranks and faculty senators. I know of other people who have been appointed to serve on those committees."

Senator Brooks continued, "And their job, in essence, will be the support and the link between those constituencies that are on that?"

Chair Fenwick said that was his understanding.

Senator Brooks again continued, "In that sense, I do see a duplication, not with the blue ribbon committee, but as these things tend to work in the community, it's that support committee that essentially will be doing all the work. If there was no faculty representation, I could understand that. To me, it would look like what is being recommended is that there will be this group that includes faculty working with the blue ribbon committee, and then there will be our committee—that we vote on here—that will be off investigating separately, then reporting to that committee. It seems like a duplication of effort and I really would like to have faculty working *with* that committee instead of looking like we are out on our own."

Senator Rich responded. "I think it's inescapable that this is duplicative. The question, really, has to do with the timing of all of this. Do we want to wait until we see what comes out of the Commission and look at it ourselves and make recommendations, with the possibility that it may be too late in the sense that politically the Commission's recommendations will go through the Board and that will be that. Or do we want to admittedly do something that's duplicative so that, when the Commission makes it recommendations, the Faculty Senate is in the position to take *its own* position at about the same time.

I think that Senator Gerlach is right that this is very much…this Student Disciplinary Process is something that should be of great concern to us. I was not familiar with this process because the Law School has its own separate process and, when the story broke in the *Beacon Journal*, I immediately went and read the regulations and was *appalled* and, particularly, with the burden of proof is absurdly low and clearly unconstitutional, by the way. This is my field.

Something has to be done. I would be concerned, actually, with what is happening in this process right now. I assume that the Student Disciplinary Process is still functioning, unconstitutionally, and potentially being quite unjust about it. So I think that this is very important and should be very important to this body. I'm sensitive to the duplication concerns although—all things being equal—I would rather not duplicate. But I'm concerned that if this body waits until the other body is done with its recommendations, that as a matter of political reality with the Board, it may just be too late. Those recommendations may go through without the Faculty Senate having, at that point, meaningful input."

Senator Mann agreed with much of what was being said. "I can put your mind a little bit more at ease, I am actually one of those persons who sits on the Hearing Board. I know you mentioned 'burden of proof.' Personally I've always held a higher standard than technically what you're supposed to, simply because I thought it was the moral thing to do. However, having said that, I have seen first hand what is occurring with some of these boards. I have worked with the UAPD; I have seen questions about evidence and I've seen questions about training procedures. I do have very, very strong reservations about how things are being handled. Personally I have been here for so many years and have seen how issues in the past have been handled by the Administration, I cannot say with 100 percent certainly that I necessarily trust them. Pardon me for that. Therefore I would be inclined to say yes to duplication. If nothing else, I have seen them put together resolutions and pass them to the Board with little outside conversation from other people; I have seen that many times. I believe it would be a wise and prudent thing for us to be ready with our own well-thought-out, well-researched recommendations when they come out with theirs. For me this is particularly important.

President Proenza said they would be incorporating another graduate student. Initially that was not the case. I've written to him quite a few times, stating our case, pleading for Graduate students to have representation on that Commission. He finally agreed to give us a representative voice in that group.

This is an issue which affects how every single student on campus is going to be tried, whether they are going to be expelled, the level of proof that has to be done [presented] against them, whether felons can live in our residence halls. It has to do with the safety of our students; it has to do with the well-being of our students. As a representative of 5,000 students on this campus, I would urge every single one of you to do everything in your power to support us in our time of need, to protect our rights, our liberty, and our freedom and look into this thing which is possibly challenging that. Thank you."

Senator Gerlach suggested that "the Executive Committee establish and appoint members to this *Ad hoc* Procedures Committee. It seems to me that this might leave the door *wide open* for the Executive Committee to avoid too much duplication by appointing a member—maybe the same members—that this advisory or collection committee—whatever it's referred to here."

Chair Fenwick clarified that it is the Support Committee.

Senator Gerlach continued with his recommendation. "Maybe the Executive Committee sees fit and wise, it could make that *our* Senate committee. Therefore there would be no duplication of efforts and we could demand that we get a report back to us."

Chair Fenwick offered to make a recommendation. "Since we do not know officially who is appointed to the Support Committee, since we do not know the full extent of the *charge* that the Administration will give them, one possibility is that we table this motion until the May meeting, when the charge and the people on that committee are known, then we can act appropriately."

Senator Stratton directed everyone's attention to the last sentence in the motion. "The Executive Committee's charge to the *Ad* hoc Student Discipline Committee reflect *coordination* with the President's Committee." It seems to me that already the motion has taken into account that there will be some coordination between the two."

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF APRIL 6, 2006

<u>APPENDIX A</u>

<u>FINAL 2006 GRADUATION STATISTICS</u>

<u>APPENDIX B</u>

Executive Committee Report
April 6, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

First, two announcements. The search for a new administrative assistant for the Faculty Senate Office has been completed and a recommendation is being forwarded. We will keep the Senate informed as this progresses.

The spring election process is underway. Each of the colleges needing to elect new representatives will receive a memo with the pertinent information in the next day or two. As a reminder, the results of the election, including the number of votes cast for each candidate, should be sent to the Senate Office by May 1 so that the Executive Committee can certify the elections and complete committee assignments.

The Executive Committee met with the President and Provost on March 23 to discuss the following items.

The first topic was a lengthy discussion concerning the Student Judicial Review process. There is a great deal of concern across campus about the process and the President informed EC that a Commission was being assembled to review it. In addition to the Commission, there will be a committee made up of members from the university community that will support the efforts of this Commission in its investigation. The Executive Committee recommended the appointment of faculty senators to the support committee and the administration has agreed and is in the process of naming those senators following EC suggestions.

The EC then shared with the President and Provost that the Ad Hoc Committee on Decision Making would be bringing their conclusions and recommendations to the senate meeting today. You should have received this material on the listserv and there are also printed copies available for your reference. This item will be discussed in more detail under the New Business section of today's meeting.

And, finally, EC inquired about the results of the Customer Satisfaction Surveys that were conducted by various units in summer 2005. The data were collected and returned to the originating units, however, it was determined that even though some information could be gleaned from the reports, the response rates were low and the surveys were conducted in an inconsistent manner, making it difficult to use the data in a meaningful way. The process will be reviewed in order to improve the survey instrument and the data collection technique for the next round.

APPENDIX C

Report of the Senior Vice President and Provost
Faculty Senate
May 4, 2006

· Thank-you for your leadership and partnership with Office of the Provost in 2005-06

· Updates about Searches/Appointments

Office of Multicultural Development: Ms. Coleen Curry, Interim Director
UA Medina County University Center: Ms. Susan Louscher, Director
Associate Provost for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development and   Director of Institute for Teaching and Learning: Candidates on campus   next week
Deans searches in progress

· Joint appointment: *Design for our Future* Student Retention Planning Committee (see attached charge)

· Budget update: John Case, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Chief Financial Officer (see attached summary statement)

APPENDIX D

REPORT OF UNIVERSITY WELLBEING COMMITTEE TO FACULTY SENATE
MAY 4TH, 2006

The Wellbeing Committee met on March 20th with the following items of business:-

Conversation with Vice President Chase
Vice President Chase attended the Wellbeing Committee meeting. He said that he wished to learn more about the Committee and to listen to our concerns. We brought up with him the on-going discussion of the future Wellbeing Committee structure as expressed in the Senate resolutions of September 2005 and December 2005. We also explained the role Wellbeing has played in the past in health insurance planning and the role of a representative elected body (like PBC) in evaluating the basic tradeoffs of health care insurance absorption v other costs.

The Committee expressed its continued interest in a more adequate system of accounting relating to health care spending, as advocated by the Senate in 2003.

The Chair shared the information related to health screening (see below) and its likely costs.

Finally, VP Chase was able to tell us that the issue of travel reimbursement was being addressed with a new policy to be in place by July 1st.(see below)

Update from Wellness Subcommittee
The Chair reported information from Desnay Lohrum of Benefits on the potential for a screening program like that conducted at Kent State for its employees as a wellness initiative. Medical Mutual of Ohio, our present PPO, would arrange such a screening for those in the PPO, at a cost of $50 per person. The Wellbeing representative for Nursing is exploring the possibility of reinstituting the screening program carried out some years ago by Nursing faculty and students..

Framework for future Wellbeing Committee
The Chair reported that she had met with Dr. Midha, who will be representing the administration on this issue. She also spoke again with Senator Linda Barrett of the AAUP negotiating team. The ideas of the Wellbeing Committee on the structure of a new Wellbeing Committee have been shared with both groups as a starting point for discussion. It was agreed that there should be meetings on the issue during the summer.

Travel Reimbursement

It had been brought to the attention of the Committee that travel reimbursement of employees who use their own cars for university business had not been changed for a number of years. It remained 30 cents per mile, although the state rate was 40 cents and the Federal rate, based on a continually updated IRS study is 44 cents. The Committee members expressed their support for a system like other universities in Ohio: a rate equivalent to that estimated by the IRS. No further updating would then be necessary. Vice President Chase, as reported above, said that the problem should be solved by July 1st.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Erickson
Chair, Wellbeing Committee

APPENDIX E

REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON DECISION MAKING
FOR SENATE MEETING, APRIL 6TH, 2006

Last summer, Executive Committee of Faculty Senate set up an Ad Hoc Committee on Decision Making to review the findings of the Decision Making/ Recommending Entity Task Force (DMRE Task Force) set up in 2002 by President, Provost and Senate Chair to review the roles of the many campus-wide committees, both appointed and elected, existing on campus. The original charge of the Task Force was to audit and review the campus-wide governance, advisory and other decision-making entities and recommend improvements to our decision-making processes and structures. They were later asked to review the literature on organization and governance in higher education. The findings of the Task Force, together with their suggestions for a way forward were delivered in final form in March 2005. They can be found on the Provost's web site at *http://www.uakron.edu/provost/docs/dmtf1.pdf.* and *http://www.uakron.edu/provost/docs/dmtf2.pdf.*

The Ad Hoc Decision Making Committee represented a wide range of faculty constituencies and significant experience in many aspects of university governance. It consisted of :-
·   Rudy Fenwick, Sociology, Faculty Senate Chair
·   Elizabeth Erickson, Economics, Senate Vice Chair
·   Linda Barrett, Geography, Faculty Senator, Akron AAUP Negotiating Team
·   Virginia Gunn, Family and Consumer Sciences, Chair of DMRE Task Force
·   Peggy McCann, College of Education, member DMRE Task Force
·   Helen Qammar, Chemical Engineering, Faculty Senator
·   Richard Stratton, Economics, Faculty Senator, past Associate Director, Institutional Research
·   Dottie Schmith, Coordinator of Athletic Publications,
·   Kent Marsden, Assistant to Dean of Polymer Science, Chair CPAC
·   Jeffry Schantz, Associate Studies, Faculty Senate Executive Committee
·   Dave Witt, Family and Consumer Sciences, Faculty Senator, Akron AAUP Secretary
·   Joy LiCause, Developmental Programs, Chair, SEAC

REVIEW OF TASK FORCE FINDINGS
The Ad Hoc Committee first reviewed the DMRE Task Force findings and noted the following major points:
·   Members of the campus community have a strong tradition of involvement in decisions made at UA through the myriad of entities identified by the Task Force.
·   Although a majority of entities rated themselves as effective, time and talent need to be used more purposefully and efficiently and the results of their work needs to be used not shelved.
·   There seems to be "an accelerating lack of confidence in current formal structures"

·	There needs to be a common understanding of where authority lies and how it should be shared, with a clear outlining of structural and functional features of governance. Misunderstandings of roles have fueled tensions and mistrust

·	The effectiveness and efficiency of decision making has been reduced by "a lack of widely understood and consistent priorities and principles for planning and resource allocation; and a dearth of timely, meaningful communication about how, why and when decisions are made"

·	There needs to be " a clear and functional process for planning and budgeting that provides for meaningful campus community input".

·	There needs to be consideration by the whole campus community of whether the structure and processes of governance are adequate to deal with the real decision making issues facing us today.

·	There needs to be a way to provide "formal linkages with appropriate administrators and other "frontline" personnel who currently have little or no way of giving input to standing committees".

·	Apart from overall problems with the structure and framework of decision making, there are areas that even within the present structure need specific change. The Provost's office has initiated actions in response to some of the Task Force more specific suggestions; two priorities for the Senate are a) to review the curriculum process; and b) develop better communication among senators and constituents.

SHARED GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION

The Committee decided to review the overall governance structure as its major task. We started by becoming familiar with the literature on governance, as recommended by the Task Force, using their reading list as a base.(see Appendix) Another major source was a series of articles in the May 2005 issue of *Academe http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2005/05mj/05mjtoc.htm*, titled "Shared Governance under Fire".

We found that there has been considerable discussion on the role of shared governance with critics suggesting it is too slow and ineffective and not appropriate in a changing academic world. That new world includes reduced public resources for higher education, a major growth in part-time faculty and managerial professionals and a changing role for staff. With pressures to become more corporate and to stress production of market skills for the individual, rather than the provision of public goods for society, administrations have tended to ignore traditional shared governance and to make important decisions essentially unilaterally.

The answer to both critics and administrations given by other scholars (e.g.Rhoades, Tierney, Gumport) and university presidents (e.g. Bok) is that it is necessary to remember that the public goods role of higher education is essential: it is the university that the community relies on for development of knowledge, of creativity, of inquiry, of quality of life and of citizenship. These are an essential part of the academic mission, the values that distinguish *quality* education. To maintain this academic mission and carry it out effectively, shared governance is essential, because academic values are the essential concern of faculty. Rather than individual *customers* in the corporate model, the community and students are *clients* whose long-run interests we hold in trust. However, many of these authors also point out the need to incorporate the new managerial professionals into shared governance, so they can provide more effective direct input into decision making.

The Committee looked at alternative models for effective shared governance, including those with AAUP awards for Shared Governance (Santa Clara and Frances Marion). The Committee found that there seemed to be no one appropriate structure: the culture of the institution matters. However, it is *function* that makes for effective ("influential") senates (see Minor and AAUP on Shared Governance *http://www.aaup.org/governance/resources/govevaluation.htm*)). They participate in and have significant influence in decision making ("joint responsibility in decision making") in areas such as long-range planning, physical facilities decisions, budgeting etc. not just the purely academic issues of the university. Influential senates drive issues and help bring about effective policy change. They are concerned with the overall welfare of the university and try to incorporate all significant talent in maintaining and increasing that welfare. There is trust and mutual respect between administrators and faculty and effective two way communication.

The Committee considered that the senate structure in use at the University of Minnesota has features that are relevant to the UA: there is a University Senate which incorporates elected faculty, academic professionals, staff and students in a single body with joint committees relating to issues like planning and budgeting, but each constituency is also represented by its own elected organization (Faculty Senate, Student Senate, elected academic professionals, and staff organizations) with its own Committee structure (see *http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/constitution/sencon.htm and http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/constitution/orgchart.pdf* and Gary Engstrand "A University Senate for All", *Academe,* May 2005) *http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2005/05mj/05mjengs.htm*

SUGGESTED STRUCTURE FOR DISCUSSION

 The Committee discussed the structure shown in Chart 1 (attached) and they suggest it as a framework for discussion and modification by the university community. The structure is shown as the outer and inner parts of a wheel.

On the outside of the wheel there would be organizations representing each of the constituencies on campus. There would be the Faculty Senate now representing faculty alone: full-time faculty (bargaining and non-bargaining unit), part-time faculty, and retired faculty; CPAC representing contract professionals; SEAC representing staff; ASG representing students; COD representing the Deans; and a Department Chairs group representing Department Chairs (see Appendix for extended definitions). Each constituent organization would have its own responsibilities with standing committees and project charter committees (for limited time specific tasks).). Each of these standing or charter committees could call on another organization for additional members of their committees. For example, Academic Policies could call on appropriate contract professionals for their work. The idea is to allow as much communication as possible between constituencies related to issues that may be the major responsibility of one organization but where other constituencies on the front line have important input.   Activities directly related to bargaining units are not included in the organizations or committees represented in Chart 1 since these activities come under a legal framework specific to those units.

In the center of the wheel would be what we call the "University Senate". The function of the Senate would be to provide input into activities which are relevant to all constituent groups: planning, budgeting, physical facilities, enrollment management for example.   Committees with such

unspecified number of elected members from the organizations which represent each of the major constituent groups on campus. It would be a smaller group to allow flexibility, although there could also be a General Assembly of the elected members of all constituent organizations each semester. It must be stressed that this structure is just a *starting point:* the size of the University Senate and the number of representatives on it from each constituency are just the first of many questions that need to be discussed.

OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The Committee agreed that their objectives for the governance system including the University Senate were to:-

·   Maintain and strengthen the primacy of the academic mission

·   Consistently improve and encourage communication among the University constituencies for the facilitation of policies and procedures from the grassroots level to Board of Trustees review

·   Develop a mutual understanding among the campus constituencies with regard to shared governance, defining University priorities and the decision making process;

·   Identify and implement the necessary mechanisms for timely communication and feedback between the recommending/decision making bodies;

·   Allow constituent groups to provide input and exchange of ideas on issues affecting the welfare of the University

These objectives reflect our concern that at the present time many constituent groups feel they have no real voice in the significant decisions made on campus, although they have important front line input to contribute and an important understanding of the university to share.

We also agree with the Communications Audit and the Task Force that there are serious issues of communication on campus. These are especially severe from the grass roots up, but occur equally across constituencies. There is also the important issue of communication from the top down.

The vision of shared governance found in what was called "the Faculty Senate" but which was for all intents and purposes a "University Senate" (with elected representatives of most constituencies on campus) was destroyed by the actions of the Board in August 2003, leaving the Senate with purely academic functions. These functions are essential, but do not allow input into equally significant areas of university policy, all of which relate to an understanding of the academic mission of the university. Those decisions will only be made effectively with input from all who serve and understand the university. We want to achieve a new form of governance that deals with the problems of lack of input and lack of communication: to form an "influential"/effective Senate.

The point of this structural change is *functional:* we wish to develop an influential and effective formal system through which decision making and decision making recommendations can be made effectively on significant university-wide issues, with maximum input from those on the "front lines". This would replace a fragmented, informal non-communicating system of elected committees and ad hoc groups chosen by

joint functions would be standing or project charter committees of the University Senate. The Senate would consist of an as yet administrators, which has been perceived to have only limited input into decision making The new framework would allow the kind of two-way communication between and among groups that the University currently lacks.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The conclusion of the Ad Hoc Committee on Decision Making is that building a University Senate model is a preferred method for answering the recommendations of the DMRE Task Force. We also recommend that a committee be convened with an equal number of representatives of all participating constituencies to continue to explore the University Senate model described in the Report. We recommend that members of each constituency should choose their representatives via election or other democratic means.

The Ad Hoc Committee considers this proposal is the start of an attempt to rebuild trust, to innovate, and to develop a more inclusive discussion of governance as the Task Force recommends. It is an important issue for the whole university community to discuss at this time. The shared governance structure under which we operated ended in August 2003 and we need to rebuild. In fact NCA has made governance a particular issue for its April 2008 visit.

Respectfully submitted
Ad Hoc Committee on Decision Making

APPENDIX
Constituent Organizations

To understand the structure we are suggesting , we need to be clear about the constituent organizations.

FACULTY SENATE in the new structure would consist of the elected faculty representatives of each of the Colleges on the University of Akron Campus, the elected representatives of Wayne campus, the elected representatives of part-time faculty and the elected representatives of retired faculty. The Committee structure could remain as it is at present, although the Senate might wish to review its Committee structure and/or descriptions of activities to reflect better the real academic issues in the University.

CPAC (Contract Professionals Advisory Committee) serves as an advisory body to the president on matters relating to employment and any other issues for contract professionals and on matters relating to any other issues directed to the committee. The committee shall maintain one (1) Standing Committee named The Contract Professional Grievance Committee, "CPGC" whose members are appointed from the CPAC membership. All other committees shall be of a "project charter" nature and be assigned as needs arise.

SEAC (Staff Employees Advisory Committee) serves as an advisory committee to the President of The University of Akron in matters concerning the University's non-bargaining staff employees. The Committee is comprised of 12 members elected by University of Akron Staff or appointed by the President to serve three year terms of office.

ASG (Associated Student Government) represents undergraduate students. It has been reorganized recently. Information on its structure and function can be found at*http://www2.uakron.edu/asg/aboutus/constitution_bylaws.htm*

The Graduate Student organization By Laws are at (under search).

COD (Council of Deans): The Council is referred to in University regulations (although I couldn't find a description of its function). The DMRE Task Force states that "it appears to be a communication/staff meeting for provost rather than decision making body. Lacks a role in formal structure. Concur with communication audit recommendation that deans need to be engages in direct and candid discussion of the critical role they play".

DEPARTMENT CHAIRS. The DMRE Task Force stated that the Department chairs reported that their group was informal, although it has features of a formal group, including an elected chair and meeting schedule. The Task Force report states : " Recommend that consideration be given to whether there is a formal group constituted or at least formal representation on committees that would benefit from chair input (e.g. APC and ASSC)"

Bibliography

Derek Bok, "Academic values and the Lure of Profit", *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* April 4th , 2003

Patricia Gumport, "Divided We Govern?", *Association of American Colleges and Universities, Peer Review*, Spring 2001

James Minor, " Understanding Faculty Senates: Moving from Mystery to Models, *The Review of Higher Education,* 27:3, Spring 2004.

Gary Rhoades, , " Capitalism, Academic Style and Shared Governance", *Academe,* May 2005

William Tierney, James Minor, *Challenges for Governance: a National Report,* Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, University of Southern California, 2003.

William Tierney " Why Committees Don't' Work: Creating a Structure for Change, *Academe,* May-June, 2001

Reference Readings Decision Making Recommending Entity Task Force

Joint Statement on Academic Governance (1966) *http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Govern.htm*

Association of Governing Boards Statement on Institutional Governance (1998)

http://www/aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Govern.htm

Central Michigan University Matrix : *Report of DMRE Task Force, Part II*

CPAC shall consist of thirteen full-time contract professionals employed by the University of Akron. Eight members shall be elected by the contract professionals from the main campus. Two members shall be appointed by the president and two shall be appointed by the seated "CPAC" committee. One member will be elected from the University of Akron's Wayne campus. The seated executive director of human resources shall maintain permanent ex-officio member status and offer regular advisory assistance. The office of general counsel shall provide assistance as appropriate.

Gumport, Patricia (2001), Divided We Govern?

http://www.aacu-edu.org/peerreview/pr-sp01/pr-sp01feature1.cfm

Del Favero, Marietta (2002), "Faculty – Administrator Relationships and Responsive Decision making Systems: New Frameworks for Study"

http://www.usc.edu/dept/chepa/gov/rf2002/delfavero.pdf

CHEPA (2003), Challenges for Governance: A National Report

http://www.usc.edu/dept/chepa/pdf/gov_monograph03.pdf

Minor, James T., Understanding Faculty Senates: Moving from Mystery to Models

http://journals.ohiolink.edu/local-cgi/send-pdf/040714104734518881.pdf

The University of Tennessee System ,http://chancellor.tennessee.edu/docs/SharedGovernance.pdf

College of New Jersey , http://www.tcnj.edu/~steering/review.html

Brown University, http://www.brown.edu/Faculty/Faculty_Governance/recommendations/FacultyGovernanc

eII.pdf

ACE Reports

http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/on-change/on-changeI.pdf

http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/on-change/on-changeII.pdf

http://www.acenet. http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/on-change/on-changeIII.pdf

http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/on-change/on-changeIV.pdf

http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/on-change/on-changeV.pdf

Tierney, William G., Why Committees Don't Work: Creating a Structure for Change

http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2001/01mj/mj01tier.htm

Tierney book review, see *Report of DMRE Task Force Part II*

Cameron and Smart, Maintaining Effectiveness Amid Downsizing and Decline in Institutions of

Higher Education, http://journals.ohiolink.edu/local-cgi/send-pdf/040714113335520763.pdf

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX G

**Approved Resolution for Establishment of University Senate Exploratory Committee
Presented to the Faculty Senate – April 6, 2006**

WHEREAS the Ad Hoc Decision Making Committee appointed by EC recommends that a committee be convened to explore the University Senate model of shared governance described in their report, and

WHEREAS the Ad Hoc Decision Making Committee recommends that an equal number of representatives be chosen from each constituency for this committee and

WHEREAS the Ad Hoc Decision Making Committee recommends that these representatives be chosen by a democratic method,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate accept the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee that a committee, to be known as the University Senate Exploratory Committee, be convened to explore the University Senate model outlined in their report, and

BE IT THEN RESOLVED that the members of the University Senate Exploratory Committee be selected by a democratic process from among the following constituencies: *four sitting members from Faculty Senators with faculty rank, two members per constituency from CPAC, SEAC, Council of Deans, Department Chairs, Associated Student Government, and Graduate Student Government.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate Executive Committee appoint the *four Senators with faculty rank* to serve on the University Senate Exploratory Committee and that these four appointments be subject to the consent of the Faculty Senate…

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the chair of the Faculty Senate convene the first meeting of representatives from interested groups.

APPENDIX H

MOTION IN REGARD TO STUDENT DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

On March 15, 2004 the faculty of the Department of Public Administration and Urban Studies requested that the Faculty Senate consider Student Disciplinary Hearings.

MOTION FOR SENATE ACTION

Be it resolved that student conduct and discipline is a matter of concern for all faculty. Student disciplinary hearings are conducted by Student Judicial Affairs. As stated on page 29 of the 2005-2006 Undergraduate Bulletin, "The development and enforcement of standards of conduct of students is an endeavor which fosters student personal and social development."

It is moved that the Faculty Senate:

1) Investigate and evaluate the processes and procedures for student disciplinary hearings, including the standards of proof. In particular, this evaluation should consider if the higher standard of proof, such as a preponderance of the evidence, should be used in all disciplinary hearings, or in hearings where the allegations effect the reputation of the student.

2) That the Executive Committee have authority to establish and appoint members to an ad hoc Student Dicipline Procedures Committtee to undertake this task.

3) That the Executive Committee establish a time line for the ad hoc committee task with the goal of having a preliminary report presented to the Senate by October 2006.

4) That the executive committee work with and coordinate with the President's Committee and Advisory commisssions that are investigating matters related to student discipline. And that the Executive committee's charge to the ad hoc Student Discipline committee reflect the corrdination with the President's Committee.

Respectfully submitted April 6, 2006